Yes because it is a reminder to everyone that a person with disabilities should not be defined only by their disability. It also reminds people of the many characteristics of identity that make up a person, and that judging or defining someone by only one characteristic such as a disability is both unfair and incomplete.

I remember watching a movie in CEP 241, about deaf culture and how many deaf people chose to go to deaf colleges/high schools, live in areas of the country where mostly deaf people live, and they choose not to learn how to verbalize/speak because they feel the rest of the world doesn't cater to or understand them so why should they learn to speak and try to fit into a world they don't feel welcome in. The movie also talked about labeling and the deaf people being interviewed said I can't walk away from being deaf, and I don't want to, and I was born this way and it is a large part of my life so using people first language (they felt) only makes other non-deaf people feel like they are "being nice", when actually the people first language is basically saying that being deaf is unwanted burden, or something deaf people if given the choice would separate themselves from.

After reading the Wikipedia article (because the Edwin article will not open), I believe the National Federation for the Blind feels that people first language is discounting the fact that for people who are blind, being so is a big and important part of their lives, and an aspect that makes them unique is this world. I also think the federation sees the people first language as a language made for people without disabilities to make them feel like they are being more linguistically sensitive when actually, it is doing the reversal and putting having a disability as something negative that should be separated from the disabled person's identity.

I like people-first language, I think it is appropriate and shows the beginnings of a linguistically cultural sensitive evolution that is currently happening with regards to people with disabilities, that HAS happened for other targeted groups of people years ago. I also honestly believe that people with disabilities are the "final frontier" in getting cultural/social equality in mainstream America.

Goldfish uses history to explain how people in different geographical areas have viewed disability. He then states that using the most correct terminology depends on person's geographical area, identity politics, the specific disability that affects the person, and the social history of what many of the terms commonly used such as handicapped or disability have meant in different areas where the person lives. Goldfish also states that the term disability has a negative connotation such as being something wrong with the individual (in America and Canada) and that the prefix dis- is a negative prefix. He also stares that a person's disability is something that fully belongs to the individual and although in society it is considered a negative it is not all that the person has to offer. So Goldfish agrees with the appropriateness of using people- first language saying it does acknowledge the disability but doesn't let the disability be the only way to define a person.